

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 991

CS 502 710

AUTHOR Ragan, Sandra L.
 TITLE A Frame Analysis of New Yorker Cartoons.
 PUB DATE Nov 79
 NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
 Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio,
 TX, November 10-13, 1979)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Caricatures; *Cartoons; Content Analysis; *Creative
 Art; *Humor; Identification (Psychological);
 Periodicals; *Popular Culture
 IDENTIFIERS Communication Research

ABSTRACT

Frame analysis of 85 cartoons from "The New Yorker" magazine was used to discover the significant keys, or metacommunicative characterizers, of cartoon humor. It was hypothesized that these keys/characterizers function to cue the readers so that they frame the message of the cartoon in a way that permits a humorous interpretation of the cartoon's content. Four major characterizers are described and analyzed: the cartoon form, its convention of graphic, pictorial representation; caricature, or the obvious exaggeration in the depiction of cartoon characters' gestures and expressions; social breaching, where a situation depicts the violation of normal social expectations, assumptions, and rules; and rekeying, which is the literal or concrete transformation of a metaphoric or abstract concept. (RI)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED178991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Frame Analysis of New Yorker Cartoons

Sandra L. Ragan

The University of Texas at Austin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra L. Ragan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

C550271D

Abstract

Frame analysis is used to examine 85 cartoons from The New Yorker magazine in an attempt to discover significant keys or metacommunicative characterizers of cartoon humor. The investigator hypothesizes that these keys function to cue the individual to frame the message of the cartoon in a way which permits a humorous interpretation of the cartoon content. Four major characterizers are described and analyzed—the cartoon form, caricature, social breaching, and rekeying.

A Frame Analysis of New Yorker Cartoons

Introduction

This paper is a frame analysis of cartoons selected from The New Yorker magazine. Its purpose is to determine whether there are keys or metasignals which cue the cartoon viewer to interpret cartoon content as humorous. Based upon an examination of 85 cartoons, four major humor characterizers are analyzed and described - the cartoon form, caricature, social breaching, and rekeying. Each characterizer functions as a key which instructs the viewer to frame the content of a cartoon in a manner which allows for a humorous rather than a straight interpretation. My hypothesis is that the use of frame analysis in cartoon humor provides insight into the discriminatory process we utilize to correctly assess the meaning of ambiguous, non-literal, or metaphoric messages.

Frame analysis was chosen as a theoretical base for studying cartoons because it provides a provocative set of terms for interpretation of humor messages. Goffman (1974) asserts that we frame messages to give them meaning; we perceive cues which characterize or place a psychological mindset on a string of messages (or a strip of activity) and are thus able to understand non-literal, metaphoric messages - those not intended as "straight activity." These cues or "keys" consist of a set of conventions which transform one activity into another activity, patterned on but substantively different from the first activity. Because these keys function to characterize or qualify a situation or activity, they are metacommunicative signals; they are messages which either implicitly or explicitly define a frame, giving the receiver instructions in understanding the messages within that frame (Bateson, 1955). The ability to perceive and to discriminate these metacommunicative signals is seen as an inherent, unconscious

cognitive capability. Bateson (1972) declares that those of us who are not schizophrenics are able to use "abstract labels" to identify what sort of message we are receiving, yet we cannot identify these labels—we merely make correct guesses. Goffman (1974) also asserts that errors in framing are rare, "...that our interpretive frameworks are more or less adequate" (p. 440) since the context (compatible only within one frame understanding) rules out wrong interpretations and rules in the right one.

Since humor necessarily turns on a keyed message, a transformation of material from a serious to a non-serious frame, humorists rely on a discriminatory capability in order that their message be perceived. While this discriminatory process may occur on an unconscious level in humor interpretation, my hypothesis is that some of the "abstract labels" or keys to humor can be discovered upon analysis—one can become aware of a conscious, cognitive processing of humor characterizers by determining what these characterizers are. The psychological theory of humor best adapted to such an analysis is the incongruity theory which posits that humor springs from the "disjointed, ill-suited pairings of ideas or situations or presentations of ideas or situations that are divergent from habitual customs" (Keith-Speigel, 1972). (This theory of humor enjoys widespread acceptance, incongruity features being a basis for much contemporary humor.) My purpose in this paper is to study the context of incongruous humor by pointing out the framing cues which define a situation as humorous and make it incompatible in another frame understanding.

Method

In an attempt to discover the keys that signal humor, I chose to study the cartoon since the graphic nature of this form of humor allows a processing of both visual and verbal content. The New Yorker magazine was selected as a source of

cartoons because of the sampling it provides of a wide variety of contemporary cartoon art. A perusal of seventeen issues of the magazine, dating January - October, 1977, yielded a set of 85 cartoons which I selected solely on the basis of (1) whether they immediately appeared humorous to me and (2) whether the source of their humor appeared to be incongruity. The 85 cartoons were next categorized according to my perception of the humor-inducing element in each. Four categories emerged from this classification, each of which could be viewed as a characterizer, key, or metasignal to humor interpretation:

- (1) the cartoon form - the convention of a graphic, pictorial representation that is recognized as the cartoon
- (2) caricature - obvious exaggeration in the depiction of the gestures and expressions of cartoon characters
- (3) social breaching - a situation depicted either graphically, verbally, or in combination which violates normal social expectations, assumptions, or rules
- (4) rekeying (Goffman, 1974) - a retransformation of material which has already been keyed; e.g., a metaphoric or abstract concept rendered literally or concretely

Results: Keys to Incongruity Perception

The Cartoon Form

One hypothesis of this study is that the cartoon form itself is the most essential metacommunicative key. To be recognized as such, a cartoon must consist of activity particularly framed, activity which "...is often marked off from the ongoing flow of surrounding events by a special set of boundary markers or brackets of a conventionalized kind" (Goffman, 1974, p. 251). The bracketed strips of activity which are cartoons can be seen then as being separate from ordinary reality or

social activity and can thus be interpreted with a different set of criteria than one would employ for unframed activity (or activity framed by a different and unique set of brackets).

McGhee (1972) claims the ability to fantasy assimilate as a requisite for humor discrimination and appreciation. Using Piaget's theories of cognitive development in children, McGhee asserts that when a child encounters stimulus situations inconsistent with his knowledge of the "real world," he proceeds to fantasy assimilate or to assimilate the inconsistency into existing cognitive structures "without attempting to accommodate those structures to fit the discrepant stimulus input." But the cue which suggests that a serious or realistic interpretation of depicted events is not required is, according to McGhee, the fact that the information is presented in a drawing--this immediately signals the individual that the depicted events do not necessarily occur in reality and may therefore be interpreted or assimilated in a fantasy or imaginary fashion.

McGhee's most provocative statement is his speculation that had the cartoon events been differently framed, (experienced via photograph, film, in person, or as standard communication) a reality mode of assimilation would be more likely to occur, and thus the cartoon might not be viewed as humorous. The cartoon frame functions to give the observer "...confidence in the impossibility or improbability of the stimulus events occurring as depicted" (p. 66) and thus leads to fantasy assimilation or laughter. If the framing cue were eliminated, incongruous events might arouse other emotions - curiosity, surprise, or confusion - but not a humor reaction since a reality mode of assimilation would exist. Thus it may be necessary to know that a stimulus is intended to be funny so that laughter will be admissible and appropriate; an incongruous situation other than a joke may prove an unsuitable humor stimuli.

The cartoons analyzed suggest the cartoon form itself as an essential metasignal. Many of the cartoons dealing with relationships - especially the ones which indicate that marriage is frequently a non-ideal union - can be seen as humorous only because the cartoon frame makes that response appropriate. Fourteen cartoons depict marital situations which might be viewed as poignant and distressing were a comic interpretation not signalled by the convention of the cartoon form. These include: a wife inquiring "What's happened to our marriage?" as she and her husband communicate from separate highrise buildings; a husband's hostility at being interrupted from his breakfast newspaper to discuss the Concorde; a woman gleefully announcing to a female friend: "We've decided not to go anywhere this winter. We're saving up for a divorce;" a wife with a Polaroid camera telling her husband he will see what a drag he is in just sixty seconds; a couple driving into a town called "Splitsville;" and a woman pleading with her pathetic looking spouse to "have a few on the way home, for God's sake."

These cartoons illustrate the pathos, boredom, and disillusionment of the marital condition; they are funny only because they are framed in a way which invites the observer to temporarily relinquish his/her accustomed set of responses and adopt an emotional reaction which is appropriate within that particular context. Because of the discriminative cue afforded by the cartoon frame -- the meta-message that "this should be interpreted as a joke" -- reactions which would typically be elicited by the information presented without the frame become inappropriate and thus inhibited. And this, I would suggest, is a key element of humor: the conveyance of information in a manner which prohibits or restrains emotional responses other than laughter. The cartoon frame constitutes the only cue which guarantees this response because of all other metacommunicative signals in humor, it cannot be mistaken nor ignored.

Caricature

Another familiar cartoon convention - caricature - also denotes a significant metasignal in the cartoons analyzed. Morris (1977) in a discussion of metasignal in human verbal and nonverbal interaction describes exaggeration of movement or a "lack of action economy" as a sure cue to detecting metacommunication; e.g., the exaggerated posturings and grimaces of small children in mock battle convey to participant and observer that "this is play." In New Yorker cartoons, (and, I would speculate, to an even greater extent in less sophisticated cartoons in which graphics provide the focus for humor more than captions do) much basis for humor is located in the hyperbolic kinesics of the characters. Caricature appears as vital a metasignal as the form of the cartoon itself and is probably perceived as readily, since neither of these discriminations involves the more complex cognitive processes of incongruity recognition and resolution. Attitudes and emotional states seem particularly susceptible to exaggeration by a cartoonist; for example, (1) vanity, (2) condescension, and (3) contrition are clearly represented by, respectively, (1) an uplifted chin, an uplifted drink, and an ear-to-ear grin; (2) turned-up noses, turned-down mouth, and slit eyes; and (3) turned-down mouth, slumped shoulders, and corner-standing. (Exaggeration as a key to comic interpretation appears in at least twenty-two of the cartoons examined as listed in Appendix A.)

Part of the effectiveness of caricature in cartoon drawings hinges on the cartoonist's reliance on recognizable stereotypes—such posturings as those of the dour business executive, the pompous General, the lecherous old man, the crooked businessman, the grumpy husband, and the nagging wife are stereotypical of these characters. When a cartoonist depicts them in similar fashion, we laugh because

we can predict and recognize—this key suggesting evidence for the superiority theory of humor.

Social Breaching

Keith-Speigel (1972) notes that a regulated society assures a permanent condition of laughter, since any departure from social standards is incongruous. Departure from social standards seems particularly emphasized in The New Yorker humor which plays on its readers' recognition of these standards. While this "departure" cannot necessarily be viewed as social breaching, Garfinkel's (1967) discussion of breaching correlates in several instances with the incongruity theory of humor. In a sense, humor resulting from incongruity does "...modify the objective structure of the familiar, known-in-common environment by rendering the background expectancies inoperative" (p. 54). Reality breaching appears to differ from incongruity humor more in degree than in essence; primarily it is the cartoon frame (or any of the apparent metasignals that cue a humorous interpretation) that allows the incongruity to be resolved, whereas breaching makes it difficult to interpret a situation as a game, a deception, or a play. One condition of Garfinkel's breaching experiments was that the person could not turn the situation into a play or a joke; he could not "leave the field." Cartoon humor, on the other hand, requires us to "leave the field." The source of incongruity in New Yorker cartoon humor is frequently breaching of "What Anyone Like Us Necessarily Knows," (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 54) yet this breaching does not produce the bewilderment, uncertainty, conflict, and disorganization that it would were the situation to occur outside the cartoon frame.

A major internal key to cartoon humor perception is the recognition of social breaching—breaching of social knowledge, social expectancy or assumption, and social rules which become discoverable upon analysis. In 55 of the cartoons studied,

an incongruity-inducing breach was the object of humor. (See Appendix B for breaching categories.) Most breaches were fairly mild, depicting behavior of an unsuitable, inappropriate or unexpected nature for the context in which it occurred. For example, an executive's clowning antics breach socially accepted standards for office behavior; a passionate embrace breaches suitable public behavior standards; a playful newscaster announcing, "And now here's Andy to horse around with the news" breaches our expectancies for proper newscasting behavior. Recognition of these breaches is, of course, contingent upon social knowledge, knowledge which must be cognitively indexed by the observer before the breaching can be understood. For example, the social knowledge that service personnel do not berate their clientele must be indexed before a chef's telling a diner to stop picking at his food can be seen as humorous. Similarly, the observer has to know that U.S. socio-economic inequalities preclude the probability of two bums discussing or having "simple nervous tension" -- they wouldn't have acquired the social knowledge of that phrase since they probably don't own a television nor would they have acquired tension which we consider a working class syndrome. (Of course, the observer must also be able to index "simple nervous tension" in order to perceive the cartoon's humor. Indexing of several bits of social knowledge is common in a New Yorker cartoon, and if the hypothesis that the greater the degree of cognitive complexity in resolving a cartoon, the greater the humor response be valid, then New Yorker cartoonists strive to pack their cartoons with contemporary references and allusions. This, in fact, appears to be a standard New Yorker convention but would need to be a subject for future examination.)

Subtlety appears to a significant feature in New Yorker cartoons so that the breachings are not of a severe reality disorienting nature. Rather, comments

uttered by characters in breaching situations frequently point out socially acceptable hypocrisies: i.e., saying the unsayable, doing the undoable, the inappropriate, the socially frowned upon. A partial listing should illustrate:

- (1) A politician making a speech: "And when I err I hope you'll find it in your hearts to forgive me and my advisers."
- (2) An executive to his boss: "You leave me no choice, J.T. I'm going over your head to the American people."
- (3) A group of businessmen gesturing toward the panorama outside the office window: "There it is gentlemen. Just crying out to be exploited."
- (4) An office door with the sign: "Stoddard & Cottingham, False Advertising"
- (5) A doctor's examining a patient: "Well, as near as I can tell, you have either logus of the bogos, the heebie-jeebies, or the jim-jam-jeeters."

These situations prove humorous to us because the breaching of social acceptability functions to ridicule and satirize our institutions and behavior. Typically, we rationalize, hedge, and euphemize, taking refuge behind meaningless and nonsensical abstractions and not daring to be concrete, candid, or straightforward. Cartoonists index our commonly held social knowledge to violate our assumptions, expectations, and rules, but their breachings function not to produce an "amnesia for social structure" (Garfinkel, 1967) but an awareness of the gap between how we think things are (or how they should be) and how they actually are.

New Yorker cartoon breaching is humorous not merely because it attacks human foibles and fallibilities but also because the cartoon characters, unlike the cartoon observer, frequently fail to react to breaches of social normality. Observing

kirasics in the characters involved in situations which violate social expectancies reveals that most of them do not acknowledge obvious anomaly. For example, none of the executives around the board room table registers surprise when the chairman states: "Of course what we're doing is wrong, but that doesn't make it indefensible." Neither do facial and body gestures exhibit severe disorientation when a customer asks for slippers in a shoe store and is brought them by a dog, or when a marriage counselor says to a grumpy looking old woman and her equally grumpy looking dog: "Well, I can see there are differences to work out, but basically, I feel, you still have a sound dog-and-little-old-lady-relationship." That these characters accept such reality violations with no apparent shock makes their situation even more amusing. They become distanced from the observer who can then laugh harder at their failure to perceive incongruity.

Sometimes rules are breached that would never be thought of as rules until they are breached. Frequently, discrimination and resolution of the humor-inducing incongruity of the cartoon prompts a discovery of the rules of appropriate social behavior. Mehan and Wood (1975) discuss the "fragility feature" of reality which is evident in routine situations where we interact without explicit rules of conduct. While continually referenced in everyday life, these rules of conduct do not actually become apparent unless reality is disrupted; they then become visible upon analysis. For example, we perceive as highly inappropriate the behavior exhibited by a clowning executive—his antics are incongruous in the context of an office setting; e.g., the office frame precludes them. But in order to appreciate this incongruous keying, the cartoon observer must be cognizant of the rules of office behavior—she must recognize that the businessman violates decorum and protocol by his zany, undignified clowning. (Likewise, his secretary's explanation

of his apparently bizarre behavior - "That's Mr. Bostwick's comedic persona" - violates social expectancies even more amusingly: secretaries do not generally know nor utilize conversationally such specific literary terms as "comedic persona.") Rules governing office protocol are similarly infringed on by cartoons which depict businessmen: listing Farrah Fawcett-Majors as an item on a corporate business agenda; standing in the corner as punishment for having been smart-alecky at a meeting; twisting paper clips at their desks rather than working; indulging their colleagues in "knock-knock" jokes, and wearing dunce caps. All of these actions appear humorous because of their absurdity in the context of the business world and because the characters are adult men, generally of executive status. But, again, perception of the incongruities of these men's behaviors is contingent upon a recognition of acceptable and expected behavior or upon the social rules governing behavior in a particular context.

Additional social rules, outside the realm of work, can be recognized in much of New Yorker humor. And again the cartoon observer infers these rules because he perceives the incongruity between that which is depicted by the cartoonist and that which should be. (This discrepancy between behavior exhibited by cartoon characters and behavior which is expected, appropriate, and socially congruent would conceivably be interpreted as not amusing were the cartoon observer not granted license to characterize it as such. The cartoon form as a key which permits fantasy assimilation and does not require literal, realistic interpretation of the inscribed event appears to serve as an essential metacommunicative humor cue.) An analysis of the rules/expectancies/patterns evidenced by the cartoons reveals, for example, seventeen cartoons proscribing male-female relationship behavior. Emergent rules are that one ordinarily does not behave with total candor in such relationships (e.g., "I used to think you were a Renaissance man,

Michael, but now I think you're a Neanderthal" or "I certainly never dreamed I'd run into a classy girl like you on a two-hundred-and-thirty-six-buck flight.") and that married women frequently become meddling nags or at least the proverbial millstone—e.g., wife to reclining husband: "When I said you should be easier on yourself, I didn't mean you should let yourself off scot-free." (The ironic exception to this rule is a cartoon in which the wife actually encourages her husband to "stop off and have a few on the way home;" nonetheless, to be perceived as humorous, the social expectancy of the nagging wife must be recognized.)

Rekeyings

Another significant metasignal is the rekeying or retransformation (Goffman, 1974) of words, phrases, or concepts within the cartoon frame. In six instances, this rekeying occurs when a metaphoric or figurative notion is rendered literally by the cartoon graphic. For example, "unhealthy air quality" is literally depicted by grotesque flying creatures as one man observes to another: "The air quality certainly looks 'unhealthy' today," and in a similar vein, "mixed blessing" is literally rendered by a cartoon in which a man explains to a friend as a small oil derrick spews forth oil all over his living room, "It's a mixed blessing."

Ten cartoon graphics concretely depict words or phrases which are either abstract or hackneyed expressions and thus defy literal depiction: a posh suburb with a sign "You Are Now Entering a High-Rent District;" an Ivy League type campus with a sign "The College Of Your Choice" over its entrance; and a twenty times larger than life statue entitled "An Authority Figure." Still other rekeyings illustrate words used in unexpected or twisted ways to produce ironic incongruity; e.g., two businessmen comment on the bartering of goods in a busy street: "Trading on Wall Street is exceptionally heavy today."

The humor in all these examples is again incongruity, the comparison of two

unlike things or in some cases a logical incongruity. The cartoonists rely on our social knowledge to get their points across; we must be familiar with these phrases and aware of their usual meanings in order to appreciate the ways in which they are rekeyed. Juxtaposition of the literal and the figurative or the concrete and the abstract can also be seen as a sort of breaching, perhaps of a more sophisticated variety than the previously discussed social breachings since these involve a recognition of anomaly on several cognitive levels.

Curiously, the subject of several cartoons is the discrimination of metaphoric and literal communication or of a person's inability to perceive metacommunicative cues. In one cartoon, an angry wife berates her lazy spouse who has taken quite literally her advice to "be easier on yourself" by reclining in front of the TV. In another, a couple stands puzzled before a welcome mat which reads "a hearty welcome"—should this usually metaphoric message be interpreted literally? Another "welcome mat" cartoon is amusing because the speaker has to clarify that he is speaking figuratively: one executive behind the desk of his huge sterile office says to another who is exiting the office: "Don't hesitate to drop in anytime, Brackett. The welcome mat is always out - figuratively speaking, of course." A pivotal cartoon in this category is one which again depicts an executive, obviously speaking to a subordinate, as he says: "Confound it, Hawkins, when I said I meant that literally, that was just a figure of speech." The suggestion is, for this confused employee anyway, that all communication is keyed--there is no straight talk. All messages are metamessages.

Conclusion

Other than the immediately recognizable form of the cartoon itself, several additional cues appear in cartoon humor which signal the observer to interpret the bracketed message as comic. Of the 85 cartoons studied, 21 exhibited caricature -

exaggerated kinesics - and 19 were instances of rekeying - a literal rendering of a metaphoric concept. The vast majority of the cartoons, however, depended on incongruity perception for their humor; in 55 of the 85 cartoons, social breaching occurred which violated the reader's expectancies for appropriate behavior. (If the category of rekeyings is seen as another type of breach - the transformation of words/phrases/concepts in such a way that one's usual perception of them is altered or breached - then 74 of the 85 cartoons examined can be viewed as humorous due to breaching, a key which signals the observer to see a situation as amusing.)

Incongruity perception becomes, then, an essential metacommunicative signal, but in order both to discriminate and to resolve incongruity, vast social indexing is necessary. From analysis of these cartoons, a prototype of the typical New Yorker reader evidences: she/he must be politically aware, at least at the domestic level; (nine of the cartoons alluded to U.S. politics; only one cartoon indexed international politics) she/he must be a fairly sophisticated consumer of public media, well-versed in popular television shows and the cinema; (thirteen cartoons indexed this knowledge) she/he must recognize topical cultural artificats--punk rock, the Concorde, silicon chips, Polaroid 60-second cameras, knock-knock jokes, Quisnart, comestibles--and conventional--heard-growing, ear-piercing, self-awareness movements, liberated women, marriage counselors, and economy class flights. Most significantly, the New Yorker reader, in order to perceive the impact of these cartoons, must be cognizant of today's issues: ecology and the environment (indexed by eight cartoons); automation/technology (indexed by seven cartoons); socio-economic inequalities (indexed by nineteen cartoons); business and political corruption (indexed by seven cartoons), and marital disillusionment/dissolution (indexed by thirteen cartoons.)

The cartoonists' implicit comments on these issues might appear distressing, perturbing, at least disparaging were it not for the cartoon frame which cuts off humorous events "...from the main body of life, which has to be taken seriously (Berlyne, 1972, p. 55). Because of the frame in which humor takes place, we can "...set aside the habits and ways of thinking to which we are subject most of the time, and go over temporarily to a quite different set of attitudes and behaviors" (p. 56). A major hypothesis from this study is that while several cues signal a humor interpretation in cartoons - the cartoon form, caricature, breachings, re-keyings - the order of cognitive processing of these metasignals must begin with recognition of the cartoon form. Until the observer realizes that she must not subject the cartoon events to the rules of ordinary reality constructing - or to the framing of untransformed activity - she will not view humor as humorous.

Several questions raised by this study demand empirical validation: (1) would subjects find a cartoon's contents amusing presented without the cartoon framing? (2) what is the order of metacommunicative processing? (3) does the degree of breaching (based on the severity of the deviation from a subject's subscription to the "natural facts of life" (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 64) correlate positively with the intensity of humor reaction? (4) does cognitive complexity (determined, in part, by the amount and level of social indexing) affect this intensity? and (5) are there other equally important metasignals that cue humor interpretation in cartoons? The processes of frame analysis and metacommunication promise further insight not only into the perception of humor but also into the recognition and interpretation of any ambiguous, non-literal message.

APPENDIX A Kinesic Exaggeration as a Key to Comic Interpretation

Cartoon Number Kinesics Depicted

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1 | triumphant gesture of chemist with "breakthrough" - hand on hip, flask upheld |
| 2 | clowning of Bostwick - pen in teeth, fingers widespread, hands framing face |
| 5 | affectionate, clumsy embrace and mooning face of Carl |
| 7 | grinning complacency of wife over husband's demise |
| 8 | complacency of Geoffrey - no eye contact with wife; smugly reading paper |
| 9 | dourness of business executive - huge, downturned mouth, massive face |
| 10 | vanity of admiral - chin lifted, drink lifted, huge grin |
| 12 | smugness-snobishness of self-aware group - noses turned up, mouths down, eyes slits |
| 13 | casualness of Foster - grinning with Mickey Mouse shirt; smugness-superiority of Hoagland - condescending expression |
| 27 | pomp of General - chest thrust out, chin up, condescending, expressive, massive body |
| 29 | size of statue representing Authority - larger than life |
| 35 | stuffiness of businessman - overly fat, stupid-looking face |
| 36 | good vs. evil - black hats and white hats |
| 42 | ugliness of child - huge, open, angry mouth; angry eyes |
| 51 | contriteness of businessman - shoulders slumped, mouth down, remorseful expression |

APPENDIX A Kinesic Exaggeration as a Key to Comic Interpretation

- 53 lecherous old man - gleaming eyes and lecherous grin;
 seductive young woman - overly bosomy, hippy, and eye-shadowed
- 54 dour business executive (see 9)
- 58 crooked businessman - overweight, cigar-smoking, slanted eyes
- 66 demanding boss - huge, angry mouth, heavy brows; timid employee -
 head hung, eyes scared
- 79 stupid counselor - silly grin
- 83 grumpy husband - tense, wrinkled, angry face

APPENDIX B Breaching Categories

I. <u>Cartoons which breach appropriate professional behavior:</u>	<u>Total</u>
Numbers 2, 4, 13, 16, 17, 24, 26, 31, 44, 48, 51, 52, 54, 56, 58, 65, 84, 85	18
II. <u>Cartoons which breach appropriate social behavior:</u>	
Numbers 5, 6, 7, 18, 33, 40, 42, 43, 62, 64, 77, 78	12
III <u>Cartoons which breach reality (fantasy cartoons):</u>	
Numbers 10, 11, 14, 38, 41, 49, 50, 55, 63, 67, 68	11
IV. <u>Cartoons which breach usual definitions/concepts of words:</u>	
Numbers 1, 3, 12, 20, 66, 73	6
V. <u>Cartoons which breach expectancies of social class behavior:</u>	
Numbers 28, 45, 61, 71	4
VI. <u>Cartoons which breach logical expectations:</u>	
Numbers 19, 21, 29, 47	<u>4</u> 55

References

- Bateson, G. A theory of play and fantasy. Psychiatric Research Reports, 1955, 2, 39-51.
- Bateson, G. Steps to an ecology of mind. New York: Ballantine, 1972.
- Berlyne, D.E. Humor and its kin. In J.H. Goldstein and P.E. McGhee (eds.) The psychology of humor: theoretical perspectives and empirical issues. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Garfinkel, H. Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentiss-Hall, 1967.
- Goffman, E. Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Keith-Speigel, P. Early conceptions of humor: varieties and issues. In J.H. Goldstein and P.E. McGhee (eds.) The psychology of humor: theoretical perspectives and empirical issues. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- McGhee, P.E. On the cognitive origins of incongruity in humor: fantasy assimilation versus reality assimilation. In J.H. Goldstein and P.E. McGhee (eds.) The psychology of humor: theoretical perspectives and empirical issues. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Mehan, H. & Wood, H. The reality of ethnomethodology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Morris, D. Manwatching: a field guide to human behavior. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1977.